

82 ADJOURNMENT MOTION *re* THE SERIOUS INSECURE SITUATION
CREATED IN THE CASE OF TEACHERS HANDLING SANSKRIT,
ARABIC AND URDU IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS BY
THE PASSING OF G.O. NO. 1344, EDUCATION,
DATED THE 12TH JULY 1956

[Mr. Chairman] [18th December 1956]

first speaker to-day. Further, this is neither an urgent matter nor a matter of recent occurrence. The Government Order was passed on 14th July 1956, five months ago.

3-20
p.m. * SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: The Government Order is coming into effect only now. Much time has been taken to circulate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I rule the motion out of order.

Discussion on the Budget will now commence.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR: Sir, before the discussion starts, may I be permitted to inform the hon. Member that orders have been issued by the Government that teachers of five-years' standing and those who are above the age of 45 years should not be affected on account of this Government Order?

III.—GENERAL DISCUSSION ON THE BUDGET FOR THE YEAR
1957-58.

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am glad that I have been given the opportunity of speaking first on the Budget for the year 1957-58. Now, what I wanted to say with regard to the Government Order is this. The Government Order has been passed and rule 60 of the Madras Educational Rules is sought to be enforced with regard to the three languages—Sanskrit, Arabic and Urdu. Rule 60 of the Madras Educational Rules says that if in a particular area a minority community lives and the children of that community through their parents claim instruction through the medium of a language that is different from the regional language or the mother-tongue, then provision can be made for that purpose by the Government if there are 15 such children in each of the Forms I to III or 45 such children in all the three Forms put together and 45 such children in all the three Forms IV to VI put together. Rule 60 refers only to the introduction of a language as a medium of instruction in all subjects in the case of a minority community that wants that language to be the medium of instruction. That rule has no application whatsoever to the teaching of an additional language, say, a classical language like Sanskrit, Arabic or Urdu. The action of the Government in passing this Government Order is not at all proper. Sanskrit has been there for a number of years and the other languages also have been there for a number of years. We are not asking for these languages to become the media of instruction. We are only asking for these languages to be taught additionally for two or three periods in a week. We do not want all subjects to be taught through the medium of these languages. What is contemplated in rule 60 of the Madras Educational Rules is the introduction of a language as a medium of instruction. The application of this rule to this case, i.e., the teaching of an additional language, is quite improper. It was never thought of and

18th December 1956] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthi]

it could never have been thought of by the framers of those rules that such a rule as rule 60 would be applied to classical languages which were to be taught as additional languages. It was simply intended as a safeguard for the minorities that they would be taught through the medium of their languages in case there were 45 such children in Forms I to III or 45 such children in Forms IV to VI. So, the application of that rule to the teaching of an additional language like Sanskrit is improper. Now, let us see what the consequences are. The Government Order has been passed in the middle of the year. Nobody expected that such a Government Order would be issued by this Government. Now, they say that provision of facilities for the teaching of Sanskrit cannot be made if there are less than 45 children studying Sanskrit in Forms I to III or 45 children studying Sanskrit in Forms IV to VI, and this rule applies to the teaching of Arabic and Urdu also. In a statement of the Government during question-time I was provided with information that out of the thousand and odd secondary schools, middle and high schools, in this State, only about 250 schools had provision for the teaching of Sanskrit. So, already we have got provision for this in only 25 per cent of the schools. Many of the district board schools have not made provision for the teaching of Sanskrit or have withdrawn the facilities for its teaching. Now, this order would surely sound the death-knell of Sanskrit and would drive the last nail into the coffin of Sanskrit. There is no doubt about that. Already the Madurai District Board has—I speak subject to correction—I understand, issued notice to teachers under its control, I mean, to Sanskrit Pandits, saying that their services would not be required from the 1st June 1957. There will not be teaching of Sanskrit in many of these schools. Hundreds of schools would be affected. Still more, a larger number of Sanskrit and Arabic Pandits and Munshis will be affected. The number of Arabic and Urdu Munshis affected may be less than the number of Sanskrit Pandits affected. I do not know why the Government passed this order. I do not know what is in the mind of the Government in passing this order. Sanskrit has been there for a number of years. If it is not to be honoured as a classical language, it ought to be honoured at least as a treasure-house from which we can cull out the highest treasures relating to engineering and medicine even to-day. Even for many other things, it is a storehouse from which we have not yet drawn enough. When we want more encouragement for the study of Sanskrit, when the Union Government have appointed a Commission for Sanskrit, and when a questionnaire has been issued by that Commission as to how Sanskrit can be more popularised in order to bring out the treasures therefrom so that they may be utilised for the full benefit of the Indian citizens who belong to a sovereign, democratic Republic, to enable them to take their full place in the company of nations, I do not know why this State Government, particularly when other State Governments have not done anything, have taken it into their heads to ban the study of Sanskrit.

[18th December 1956]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Member whether he would like to have a minimum number of students to be fixed at all. Suppose there is only one student. Even then, would he like to permit the appointment of a Sanskrit Pandit or would he like a minimum number of students to be fixed? If he would like a minimum to be fixed, then what should be the minimum is a different thing altogether. But if the hon. Member waxes eloquent and says that we are not for the study or teaching of Sanskrit and that no minimum number of students should be fixed, then it is quite a different thing altogether. I am sorry that he is taking a wrong attitude as far as this matter is concerned and that a wrong interpretation is being put on the Government Order. I would be the last person to discourage the study of Sanskrit. But we thought that in the interests of economy in public expenditure, it was necessary that there should be at least a minimum number of students to warrant the appointment of a Sanskrit Pandit in a school and the payment of money from the public coffers, because it should be usefully spent. If there are only 5 students and a Pandit is employed and if we are asked to pay from the public coffers the necessary grant, then certainly we cannot justify that expenditure. It is only from that point of view that this order was passed. Therefore, I would like the hon. Member not to cast aspersions as if we were not for the teaching of Sanskrit or the appointment of Sanskrit Pandits. On principle, he may say that a minimum of 45 students should be fixed or he may say what the minimum should be. But if he should say that even for one student or five students we should employ a Sanskrit Pandit and that we should pay for him from the public coffers, certainly he would not be justified.

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Sir, I may at once submit to the Government that it is their duty to see that the study of Sanskrit and other languages is encouraged and no such order ought to have been issued now. In the case of Hindi, the Government have gone to the extent of saying that recognition ought not to be given to schools if there is no Hindi Pandit in the particular schools. The minimum that the Government can do to encourage Sanskrit is to say that no school will be given recognition if there is no Sanskrit Pandit in that school. That is what the Government ought to do, not in the interests of the study of Sanskrit, not in the interests of anyone but in the interests of the revival of culture and in the interests of getting the benefit of the treasures of Sanskrit to make ourselves fit to walk upright along with the citizens of the rest of the world. It is in that interest that I implore and beg of the Hon. Ministers to see that a rule is brought that no school would be recognised unless there is a Sanskrit Pandit in the school. If that is done, naturally students would be rushing forth. What have the Government done in the case of Hindi? What did they do when there was great opposition to the study of Hindi? In spite of all the agitation, they have been

18th December 1956] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthi]

able to bring Hindi to the forefront. Now, because Hindi has been linked with Sanskrit and Hindi has been brought into Part II of the first language, great discouragement has already been caused to the study of Sanskrit. The number of periods for the study of Sanskrit has not been enhanced at all. Now, we find that the Government have driven the last nail into the coffin of Sanskrit. If the Government go to the extent of thinking that it is a waste of public funds to pay Sanskrit Pandits if there is not the minimum number of pupils, I think that they do not have sympathy for the study of Sanskrit and that they do not want to encourage its study. That is sure as anything. If they really want to encourage the study of Sanskrit, I ask them what the need was for issuing this order just in the middle of the year. They are Sanskrit Pandits; students are there; parents are there, and every year the Budget is discussed. Why should such a sweeping order be issued now with regard to all the secondary schools? Orders can be passed then and there with reference to a particular school if the strength becomes very nominal in that school. Why should there be a general order that there should be 45 students in certain forms and that there should not be a Sanskrit Pandit, Urdu or Arabic Munshi if there were less number of students? It may be uneconomical. But, even an uneconomical expenditure has to be met in certain cases for the benefit of the country. It is the duty of the Government to popularise the study of Sanskrit. It is the duty of the Government which have been spending a sum of Rs. 10 to 12 crores on education to encourage the study of Sanskrit. After all, most of the Sanskrit Pandits and others are not in the I grade so far as pay is concerned. They are getting only a sum of Rs. 45 or Rs. 50. The Government should come forward to patronise these people. I am really sorry that in a country where Sanskrit was occupying the highest pedestal and where Sanskrit was the medium through which the culture of the country was exhibited, the study of that language should be discouraged in this fashion. It is clear from the statement of the Hon. the Minister for Education that the order would apply to all classes. There was a doubt whether provision of facilities would be withdrawn only in the case of new schools or whether it would apply to existing schools as well. Now, it is clear that the facilities would be withdrawn from the beginning of the next academic year. With due deference and regard to the Hon. the Minister for Education for what all he has done and has been doing in the past for the teachers, I would like to ask whether it is proper on his part to oust so many Sanskrit Pandits and Urdu and Arabic Munshis from employment.

SRI A. M. ALLAPICHAJ : May I know whether the hon. Member has any idea as to the number of people that would be affected?

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHJ : I now hear that the Government have passed an order which may not affect those who have had five years' experience or those who are over 45 years of age,

[Sri G. Krishnamoorthi] [18th December 1956]

Even then, what is the use? So many Pandits and Munshis will still be affected. It is not only that. It is not merely a question of those people being affected. It will affect the study of the language as such. That will in turn affect the cultural development of the country. A number of people will be thrown out of employment. What will happen to their families on the 1st of June 1957? Some of the managements may interpret this order even illiberally and send Pandits out earlier. We will find, as a result of that, a number of people being thrown out of employment. Simply because of the fact that a person has not reached the age of 45 and is only 43 or 44 years old, he will be affected. Again, simply because of the fact that a person has not put in a service of 5 years, although he has put in a service of nearly 4½ years, he will be affected. All such persons below the age of 45 and those who have put in less than 5 years' service will be affected. What will be the fate of these poor people and their families? How can the Government reconcile themselves to such a situation in the context of a socialistic pattern of society which they want to build in our country? Will it not create more unemployment? When all our efforts should be in the direction of relieving the unemployment position in the country, can we take steps which will intensify that problem? All these things have to be faced in a country where Sanskrit was very much respected and used from Kashmir to Cape Comorin. The Government should not have passed such an order. I would humbly request the Government to withdraw the order and restore Sanskrit to its rightful status. If really it ceases to be popular and if really the strength in a particular section or class falls to a very low level, the cases of such classes in particular schools should be treated on their merits and appropriate action taken wherever necessary. I agree with the Hon. the Minister for Education that there should be some popular interest for students to take up the study of that language. But then, I would also like to point out that it is the duty of the Government to create the necessary interest in the student population to take up the study of this language. The Government are taking so many steps to see that the study of Hindi and other languages is encouraged. I only want that some margin should be given in the case of Sanskrit. The Government must view it more sympathetically and come forward to afford special facilities for its study. I once again request the Government to kindly withdraw the order which states that if there is not a particular minimum in certain Forms, no provision would be made and no facility would be made available for the study of that language.

Sir, with regard to the Budget, I will be failing in my duty if I do not pay my humble tribute to our revered Education Minister for having looked into the case of teachers sympathetically during the last 4½ years. This is perhaps the second or third occasion when I take the opportunity of pointing out that I have great admiration for him for the sympathy that he has shown towards the teachers and for the way in which he has taken up the reforms with regard to the raising of the status of the teachers. The

18th December 1956] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthi]

bottom-most teacher has been benefited first. The aim of educational reform in the last two or three years has been like that. I very much appreciate that and it is really a change for the better. There were days when only the top-most men got all the benefits. In this connection, I also wish to state that we expected a little more and that we expected more clear things. We expected larger benefits before the new Government took office in June next or so. Even now there is time. This Government can give us in a concrete form certain things for which they have laid the foundation and build up the superstructure.

There was a rosy picture drawn before us that the Second Five-Year Plan would give the teachers all the benefits. Whether it was in the hands of the Government here or not, the allotment under this head was curtailed to a great extent. Instead of the expected Rs. 38 crores for Education under the Second Plan, we are told that we would get only Rs. 15 crores. Out of this sum of Rs. 15 crores, Rs. 3 crores will go to colleges, polytechnics and industrial schools. We have got only Rs. 12 crores for the promotion of elementary and secondary education during the Second Plan period. Out of this Rs. 12 crores, we thought that at least Rs. 5 crores would be allotted for the raising of the salaries of teachers. But, from the Report of the Legislature Committee on the White Paper on Education, we find that only a little over Rs. 3 crores would be made available for the benefit of teachers. Even when it was expected that a sum of Rs. 5 crores would be allotted, it was expected that every teacher would get only about Rs. 10. Now, when it is decided to spend only a sum of Rs. 3 crores, I do not know what the amount that will actually be received by the teachers will be. The Legislature Committee on the White Paper on Education have recommended and the Government have announced certain increase in the emoluments of teachers. In the case of elementary school teachers, they say that the teachers will get a special pay of Rs. 5, Rs. 6 and Rs. 7. That is, they have raised the dearness allowance as in the case of Non-Gazetted Government servants to Rs. 25. In order to see that no teacher gets less than Rs. 25 as dearness allowance, it is stated that those who are getting Rs. 18 as dearness allowance will hereafter get an additional sum of Rs. 7, that those who are getting a sum of Rs. 19 will get an additional sum of Rs. 6 and that those who are getting a sum of Rs. 20 will be getting hereafter an additional sum of Rs. 5. This increase in dearness allowance has been treated as special pay in the case of teachers. I would like to have enlightenment from the Hon. the Minister for Education on why in the case of the elementary school teachers alone, it should be treated as 'special pay'. Of course, we have no quarrel with the name. It is not merely a question of name. There is a great risk involved in calling it 'special pay'. It will not reach the pockets of the teachers in many cases: it will only reach the pockets of the managers. A sum of Rs. 3 was given as additional grant on 1st March 1954. On the floor of this sacred House, I submitted

[Sri G. Krishnamoorthi] [18th December 1956]

to the then Chief Minister and our present Education Minister that the rules should be framed in such an unambiguous way that the money reached the pockets of the teachers for whom it was intended and not the pockets of the managers. But, somehow or other—I do not know how—the money only reached the pockets of the managers in most cases. The additional grant of Rs. 3 agreed to by this Legislature did not reach the real persons for whom it was intended. The managers were saying, “Well, look here. We were already paying you over Rs. 30. The Government have now raised the grant from Rs. 27 to Rs. 30. Now, we are incurring a loss. The Government have sympathetically taken this aspect into consideration and granted this additional sum of Rs. 3.” In the same manner, the enhancement in dearness allowance which is called ‘special pay’ may not be paid to the elementary school teachers and is likely to go to the managers. Therefore, I appeal to the Government to call it ‘dearness allowance’ and not ‘special pay’. The term ‘special pay’ may be attractive and it may look as though some benefit would accrue to the teachers by way of enhanced pension or dearness allowance. But we do not want it to be called special pay, because there is every risk of its being taken away by the managements. I may tell hon. Members that in Tirunelveli district there are schools in which the service registers of teachers bear entries like ‘teacher’s pay—Rs. 30 plus Rs. 10, Rs. 30 Government grant and Rs. 10 paid by the management’. When the grant of three rupees was sanctioned for the elementary school teachers, then the entry became ‘Rs. 33—Government grant and Rs. 7 paid by the management’. The managements say, ‘We are running the schools at a loss; the Government have, therefore, been pleased to sanction an increased grant and so, naturally our contribution correspondingly gets reduced’. Now, this five rupee increase in dearness allowance will result in an entry like ‘Rs. 38 plus Rs. 2’. I have very recently verified the entries in certain service registers and I am sure there is every chance of the managements taking away this enhancement in dearness allowance which is called special pay, because the Government Order says that no teacher should be paid less than the assessed grant. The managements would say, ‘We are paying the assessed grant; now we are getting only a very small amount by way of compensation for the loss of fee income on account of full fee concessions; therefore, the Government have thought it fit to sanction a special pay of five or six or seven rupees, as the case may be, so that we may be reimbursed to the extent we have lost on account of fee concessions.’ So, Sir, I would humbly request the Government to treat this five or six or seven rupees as dearness allowance and not as special pay as far as elementary school teachers are concerned.

Then, Sir, the order that has been issued by the Government is not clear. We are not sure whether this additional amount would be paid to secondary school teachers in middle schools and B.Ts. and Headmasters in high schools. No order has been

18th December 1956] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthi]

received, to my knowledge, by the high schools that this additional sum of five rupees should be given to them also from the 1st of November 1956. We saw an announcement made by the Hon. the Minister for Education that he had received a telegram from the Central Government approving of this additional payment of five rupees to teachers. From this statement, we find that this sum is linked with the additional pay that the Government propose to grant to these teachers under the Second Five-Year Plan. The Central Government have to contribute fifty per cent in this regard. If really this additional pay is to be merged in the revised pay that has to be given under the Second Five-Year Plan, then this cannot be called a benefit to teachers as it may be called in the case of N.G.Os. There is no case of approval by the Central Government in the case of N.G.Os. Sir, even a peon in a Government office is getting a minimum dearness allowance of Rs. 25. But the teacher is to get this, according to the Government, as special pay, which may not reach him and the dearness allowance will remain still at Rs. 18. Now, I believe that this enhancement in dearness allowance is styled 'special pay' because the Government want that the teachers should not claim more pay promised under the Second Five-Year Plan. Also, I do not know why orders have not been issued sanctioning this in the case of secondary grade teachers and B.Ts.

Sir, the Report of the Legislature Committee on the White Paper on Education shows the expenditure on increase of salaries of teachers as Rs. 3 crores odd. The *per capita* cost, that is, the amount to be spent per year per pupil, is put down at three rupees. Of this, eleven annas will be taken away for midday meals and the balance, Rs. 2-5-0 is intended to meet the salary of the teacher and management expenses. Having seen all these statements, I find that the atmosphere under the Second Five-Year Plan is not very favourable to the teachers. I would like to have enlightenment from the Hon. the Minister for Education on what exactly the teacher is going to get and why the Government have postponed refixation of scales of pay for teachers to the middle of next year to be done by the new Government.

I would like to submit another thing. There are colleges, called Oriental Title Colleges, which are teaching pure Sanskrit or pure Tamil, more Tamil Colleges than Sanskrit Colleges. The pay of the principal of these colleges is to start from Rs. 100 and go up to Rs. 200. That is the pay of the principal. Where? In Tamil Nad. We want Tamil to be the official language; we want proceedings in the Legislature to be carried on in Tamil and yet we say that the principal is to get Rs. 100. There is an Oriental College at Tiruvayyar. There are other such special colleges elsewhere. We want the principal to get Rs. 100 and what is the pay, the Professor in Tamil is to get? Rs. 75-125. A B.A., B.T., in English, a foreign language, gets a starting salary of Rs. 85. But here the Professor in Tamil gets Rs. 75 and his

[Sri G. Krishnamoorthi] [18th December 1956]

maximum pay is Rs. 125. Again what does an Assistant Lecturer in Tamil in the Arts College get? Rs. 150 in the scale of Rs. 150—300. This is the state of affairs now and this ought to be remedied if we are really earnest about the promotion of our languages.

Sir, it is stated that medical concessions have been extended to village officers. I know they were clamouring for these and I am sure they deserve them also. We are indeed very glad that they are recognized to be on a par with the N.G.Os. But what sin have these teachers in aided institutions committed not to deserve these? Assurances were given on the floor of this sacred House and also these assurances found their way into the Assurance Committee that the teachers' case would be considered when their scales of pay were revised. Now there is nothing in the Report of the Committee about this or about house-rent allowance for teachers. Everything is indefinite. What is the idea of the Government? Are they going to sanction house-rent allowance and medical concessions for these teachers or not? Sir, this house-rent allowance is denied only to a particular category of teachers. More than 50 per cent of the teachers are getting it. Only teachers in aided institutions are not getting it. The Government say that aided institutions are doing a very fine job. But the teachers there live in hovels. Can they be energetic enough to teach, if they live in such places? They have been clamouring for this for the last four or five years. Even when Dr. M. V. Krishna Rao was Minister, I raised this question. According to the Government's own figures, the extra cost would only be ten lakhs of rupees. What is the size of our Budget? It is nearly of the order of Rs. 52 crores. Is this ten lakhs a big figure? It is not; but the benefit would be great to the teachers. Why should you discriminate against the aided school teachers? I would humbly request the Government just to see that house-rent allowance is given to teachers in aided institutions also and that the medical concessions are also extended to teachers.

Then, Sir, the Government have recently published the pension rules for teachers. There is a great disadvantage experienced by the teachers in the matter of pension. The last of the rules says that no 'temporary increase' will be permissible in the case of pension for teachers. This 'temporary increase' is the dearness allowance which is paid to Government and other pensioners. It ranges from four to six rupees. A higher grade teacher getting Rs. 45 will get a quarter pension on retirement which will amount to Rs. 11-4-0. If this 'temporary increase' is added on to his pension, it will increase his pension by 40 or 50 per cent. With Rs. 11-4-0, he may not get even one kanji per day. But with this 'temporary increase', he may be sure of one kanji. As I said just now, no teacher should be discriminated against and I would humbly request the Government to sanction this 'temporary increase' in the case of teacher-pensioners also.

18th December 1956] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthi]

Then, there is again rule 16 which says that if the teacher were to put in unsatisfactory work, his pension would be reduced. The wording is very vague. Who is to judge whether the work is "unsatisfactory" or not? The teacher has got so many masters over him. There is the management, there is the Headmaster, there is the Deputy Inspector of Schools and there is again the parent. Of these persons, who is to judge whether the work that the teacher has put in is unsatisfactory or not? I do not know why this restriction is put in the way of the teacher getting the small pension that is now given under the pension rules. We would request Government to delete this rule.

Then, there is rule 10 (b) which says that service prior to resignation in a particular school would be considered as service forfeited, if the resignation had been within the control of that person. But in all schools teachers are forced to resign, except in district board and Government schools. What is done in private schools is this. The management say to the teacher concerned, "You have committed so many mistakes. We will not spoil you. Let us not go up to the department. You please resign and go away. Otherwise, your certificate will be affected." This is how the poor teacher is forced to resign. It so happens that the teacher has to resign his job in one school and join another school. If the present rule saying that service prior to resignation will be forfeited, is applied, then it will cause great hardship to the teachers. Therefore, I request that Government should take steps to modify this rule and state in clear terms that all breaks would be condoned and that service prior to resignation would not be forfeited.

Then, it is said that compassionate gratuity would not be allowed to teachers. Compassionate gratuity is given to a Government servant who dies before qualifying for pension. A Government servant qualifies himself for pension if he puts in a service of not less than ten years. If the Government servant dies before putting in ten years of service, compassionate gratuity is given to his poor family because the Government think that that family of the Government servant deserves sympathy. When such is the case, why should the poor teacher alone be denied compassionate gratuity? After all, the teacher is doing the work of the Nation. He is in charge of educating the children; he is the moulder of the Nation. When such is the case and when he is doing the Nation's work, it is but fair that compassionate gratuity should be allowed to him, also, as in the case of Government servants. Therefore, this rule also should be deleted.

While we thank the Government for granting pension to elementary school teachers and secondary grade teachers, we request Government to extend this benefit to all other categories of teachers also. I also request the Government once again to grant the dearness allowance applicable to pensioners to teachers also now denied by rule 20.

[Sri G. Krishnamoorthi] [18th December 1956]

The Legislature Committee on the White Paper on Education which has given a valuable report says that the lot of the teacher ought to be improved and that he should be paid something more. The Government say that their finances are limited. During the four years I have been in this Council I have always been suggesting ways of finding more money. I have been saying to the Government, "You need not spend much on roads and other works. You can divert that money to better the lot of teachers". This was what I was saying in the first two years. There was not much response. Then I was saying to Government that within the Educational Budget they need not spend so much on building and equipment and on the Inspectorate but that they could best utilise the money thus saved for improving the lot of the teachers. That had no effect. It is now said that for improving the conditions of the N.G.O.'s working in the States, the National Development Council's attention was drawn to that question and that it had been urged by the States that the Centre should give them sufficient grants for the same. But so far as teachers are concerned, I might say that the Government need no funds from the Centre. They have got a source from which they could get money, and that source is the parents. They could always get money from the parents. If to-day even with a shrunken State, our revenue is nearly Rs. 52 crores, where is the money coming from? It is got from the parents in the form of property tax and other taxes. What harm is there in asking the parent to pay a small contribution to the Teachers' Maintenance Fund? Even in the Legislature Committee Report there is a paragraph supporting one of my suggestions. In the last page of that Report I find a beautiful version saying that text-books ought to be published by Government. They say that there is difference of opinion on this question; but, in the first instance, the publication of text-books with regard to elementary schools at least should be undertaken by Government. That is a very definite recommendation made on the last page of the Legislature Committee's Report. Asking the pupils in the secondary schools to pay one rupee per month for 10 months in a year and asking the pupils in the elementary schools to pay one rupee per quarter for three quarters in a year and utilising this money for bettering the lot of teachers, is definitely not asking too much of the parents. I was urging the Government to take up the publication of text-books, even three or four years before. That would fetch them Rs. 1 crore annually as profit and that amount might be earmarked for giving relief to the teachers. That would go a long way to improve the present condition of the teachers.

The Members of the Treasury Benches may think, "Here is Sri G. Krishnamoorthi who always talks about teachers, forgetting the other sections of the people." If I speak always on behalf of the teachers, it is because the teacher is given the task of moulding the nation. There is now the provision for midday meals to elementary school children. Some outside the House think

18th December 1956] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthi]

that I object to that provision. I say that not only the children but also their mothers who are weak and under-nourished should be fed. Providing midday meals to children in elementary schools is a social problem and not an educational problem. Out of Rs. 12 crores allotted for Education, Rs. 2 crores are provided for midday meals to elementary school children. Even in this interim Budget, for the four months of 1957-58, Rs. 10 lakhs have been provided for midday meals to elementary school children. That comes to about Rs. 2 crores for five years and when the allotment for Education is meagre, why should Rs. 2 crores be taken out of it by including the provision for midday meals under the head "Education," when the proper method is to include it under the head "Social welfare or social amenities"? The Legislature Committee have said that this work of providing midday meals should be undertaken by the panchayats and that only poor children should be fed. As I said before, this is a social problem and this ought not to be included under the head "Education". If out of Rs. 15 crores, Rs. 3 crores are taken away for collegiate, polytechnic and industrial education and Rs. 2 crores for midday meals to elementary school children, then we are left barely with Rs. 10 crores. With the elaborate schemes for training of teachers, doubling the number of schools and strengthening the Inspectorate and so on, we are left with only Rs. 3 crores for the teachers, which works out to not even Rs. 7 or Rs. 8 per teacher. Therefore, if this provision for midday meals is included under some other head and if some economy is effected in the expenditure on the Inspectorate, the amount thus saved could be utilised for bettering the lot of teachers.

Let us look at the (former) Travancore-Cochin State, it is very often said. There the percentage of literacy is very high. What is it that they do there? They run the elementary school daily only for $2\frac{1}{2}$ or 3 hours. Double the number of children are thus taught. Do they lag behind the children of Madras because of their being taught for only $2\frac{1}{2}$ or 3 hours there? But Rajaji's scheme which visualized instruction for only $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours for elementary school children and which was only a teachers' scheme sponsored by me four or five years earlier has been given the go-by. Under that scheme, with the present number of teachers, double the present number of children could have been taught. So, we can make all 4 p.m. the children literate with the present strength of teachers, in the present schools, in the present buildings and we can also pay the teachers a little more. When that scheme was brought in, there was opposition to it. Was it opposition purely on the merits of the scheme or was there a political tinge in it? That scheme aimed at half-day school for children and full-day school for the teacher. What does the Legislature Committee's Report say? It says that there is much time in the basic schools for teaching more crafts: in the Travancore-Cochin schools, children are more efficient. I would, therefore, humbly request the Government to examine this question, whether it is not advantageous to have the shift system

[Sri G. Krishnamoorthi] [18th December 1956]

in elementary schools by which with the same number of teachers, education can be extended to all the children. Of course, we have to give a little more salary to the teachers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member has taken 45 minutes now.

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: Lastly, I would refer to one more matter. Recently, Government have passed an order in respect of aided school managements with regard to compensation for loss of fee income forgone as a result of concessions granted by the Government. This gave the occasion for many school managements to curtail the salary of the teacher in the middle of their service. Hon. Members would be surprised to hear that in the teaching profession the salary of the teacher is reduced in the middle of his service, in spite of his high integrity, good character and efficient work. Can there be any profession where during the course of service, the salary is reduced? Of course, the point may be raised as to what the teachers say. They have to keep quiet for the time being and they say to me, 'You are there; you will fight for us and bring us relief'. What they say is that suddenly their salary has been reduced because fee compensation was granted by the Government and there is a rule that it is enough if what is paid as grant by Government is paid by the managements.

Now, I just got a favour from the Hon. the Minister for Education when he accepted my Resolution brought on the floor of this sacred House regarding the disparities in scales of pay of teachers. It was accepted and a provision of about Rs. 35 lakhs was also made for that purpose. The Report of the Legislature Committee on the White Paper on Education also stresses the need that irrespective of the different managements under which the teachers might be employed, teachers with equal qualifications must get the same pay. My resolution was accepted by the Government and a provision of about Rs. 35 lakhs was made, accepting the principle that secondary grade trained teachers should get the same scale. When Government accepted that resolution and made the necessary provision also, this ought to have been enforced and the salary scales should have been brought into force as from 1st April 1956. I do not know why they delayed it. If they delayed it in view of the reorganization of States, then after reorganization it should have been given retrospective effect from 1st April 1956, in respect of teachers now serving in the Madras State. Somehow or other, from the Budget speech of the Hon. Minister and the Budget presented, we find that some money has been left unspent under the Educational Grant on account of the non-implementation of certain schemes. Are not the teachers entitled to have the scales of pay as from 1st April 1956, the beginning of the first year of the Second Plan?

Another point is this. In the matter of fixation of pay also, it has been said, "You, teachers, are not eligible for weightage for service". Very senior teachers do not get any benefit at

18th December 1956] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthi]

all from this. If they are getting Rs. 48, it is said that the pay will be fixed as Rs. 47 *plus* Re. 1 and not at the next higher stage in the scale; and next year they will get only Rs. 49. That is the order. Usually, any refixation of pay in 1947 it was done like that—takes into account the number of years of service put in and weightage is given in refixing the pay. Accordingly, here the teacher must be given weightage and his pay fixed at the next higher stage. But this is not done. Actually no weightage is given and the salary is fixed below the stage in the scale and the difference is shown separately. That is the gist of the order that has been issued by the Government. The senior teachers get nothing. Well, now, that is not the object with which I brought in the Resolution. They must be given weightage, say, one increment for every four years of service. In the case of teachers who are on higher scales, as in the Government schools and aided and municipal schools giving Government scales, they are to be pulled down in scales. Have we ever heard of a person who is supposed to be benefited under the Second Plan being pulled down in pay by some Rs. 5? This is nothing short of giving by the right hand and taking away by the left hand.

Again, with regard to dearness allowance, it has been generally accepted that no man, not even a peon, in the service of the Madras Government should get less than Rs. 25 as dearness allowance. The same principle should be applied in the case of teachers also. In refixing the pay, weightage for service should be given. This is all my request.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me this opportunity to speak elaborately and in such detail.

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM: Mr. Chairman, Sir, before taking up the Budget, I wish to convey the hearty welcome of this House to our new Governor, Sri A. J. John, and to express our appreciation of the sentiments in his message on the assumption of the office of Governorship.

Sir, this is an interim Budget and we are happy to find, on an analysis of the figures placed before us, that the financial position of our State is quite sound, thanks to the efficient handling of the finances of the State by the Ministry of Finance. All our public borrowings have been invested in productive schemes and with satisfactory returns from them, the financial stability of the State is assured. At the same time, we should bring home to the Central Government that during the last few years we have levied several new taxes and that we have levied every kind of surcharge—surcharge on land revenue, surcharge on motor vehicles tax, surcharge on electricity rates, agricultural income-tax and so on, and I may safely say that we have thus reached the maximum taxation limit in our State.

DR. V. K. JOHN: Are we introducing more taxes after the Elections?

[18th December 1956]

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : No, I do not think so.

4-10
p.m.

I feel, Sir, that we should make a fervent appeal to the Finance Commission and that the Government of Madras should seriously apply their minds to this problem and make their representations to the Central Government and the Finance Commission that they should recognise these factors and give us the needed relief and substantial allotment in the permanent re-allocation of the share of the Central taxes to this State.

We find, Sir, that several new schemes have been provided for in the Budget Estimates for 1957-58, notably schemes relating to the development of small-scale industries and agricultural expansion. Educational schemes in the Budget deserve special mention. Hon. Members would have gone through the Report of the Legislature Committee on the educational policy to be followed in this State. The difficulties of poor parents, as have just now been pointed out by the hon. Member Sri G. Krishnamoorthi, were emphasized by the Committee. We are glad that the Government were able to provide for free midday meals to school children, especially in rural areas, a sum of Rs. 10 lakhs. Some attempt has been made through the activities of the Director of Public Instruction to tap private philanthropy for providing midday meals to children in schools in rural areas. But such a wholesome need cannot be left entirely to private philanthropy to be met however much we are charitably disposed in our country. So, this provision of Rs. 10 lakhs in the Budget for supply of free midday meals to poor children in elementary schools in the rural areas should be welcomed and I am sure hon. Members will appreciate this act of Government.

Speaking on educational matters, the hon. Member Sri G. Krishnamoorthi has waxed eloquent about the appointment of Sanskrit Pandits and accused the Government of discouraging the study of Sanskrit. The Hon. the Finance Minister has explained the circumstances in which the Government Order was issued. Perhaps, the Member opposite is not aware how much the Hon. the Finance Minister is interested in the study of Sanskrit. I know that the Hon. Minister himself devotes an hour everyday to the study of Sanskrit and that no visitor is allowed to see him during that time. That shows how much the Hon. the Finance Minister is personally interested (Interruption) and I say that we are all equally interested in the matter. The hon. Member Sri T. P. Sreenivasavaradan knows that I have myself been a student of Sanskrit in the Hindu High School, Triplicane, and I may tell the hon. the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that we are not against the development of this ancient language in our country.

We find, Sir, in the Budget Estimates that there are as many as 142 new schemes. Hon. Members would have appreciated if a short note on each of the more important schemes included in this Budget had been made available to us so that we might have the details and the salient features of the new schemes for reference

18th December 1956] [Sri T. Purushotham]

and discussion. I trust that the Government would consider this suggestion of mine when presenting the Budget in the coming years.

We find that there is an allotment of a sum of Rs. 39,700 under Demand IV—Forests, for a scheme for preservation of wild life. I should like to plead, in this connection, for the formation of a separate Department or at least for the appointment of a separate officer to look into matters relating to preservation of wild life. The official statement made recently in the Lok Sabha that the cheetah and such other varieties, distinctly Indian varieties, of wild life are getting extinct should set us thinking. I had an opportunity to draw public attention to this question. The present arrangement by which the responsibility for preservation and development of wild life is entrusted to the Forest Department is not satisfactory. We are attaching the greatest importance to the development of tourist traffic. Wild life, I am sure hon. Members will agree, if properly managed and developed, would be a source of great attraction to tourists. The provision in the Budget now, I know, is for the development of the Bird Sanctuary at Vedathangal in Chingleput district. We have also got the Mudumalai Wild Life Sanctuary. More sanctuaries may be started if there is a separate department to attend to these matters. A sanctuary at Vedaranyam and a sanctuary in Top Slip in Coimbatore district could be started and developed. I trust that the Government would take steps to form a separate department or that at least a Special Officer, well-trained and with necessary equipment, would be appointed in our State for the preservation and development of wild life.

Hon. Members would remember, Sir, the question that I raised some time back about the ever-growing demand in the Police Budget. I think we should be glad to be assured now that it has been the endeavour of the State Government to reduce progressively the non-developmental expenditure in the Budget and that the expenditure on the maintenance of law and order and also the allotment for the collection of revenue have been kept down as far as possible. But, I cannot but refer, in this connection, to the need for retrenchment of staff in all the departments, commensurate with the shrinking size of the Madras State. Shri B. N. Datar, Minister for Home Affairs in the Home Ministry of the Central Government, stated in the Rajya Sabha last week that as a consequence of reorganization of States, 5,900 Government servants were transferred from Madras to Kerala for two large districts and one taluk transferred to the latter whereas—I request the hon. Members to note the figures—7,500 Government servants were transferred from Travancore-Cochin to Madras for four and a half taluks transferred to us. Significant figures these and I am sure that this House has a right to know why there is this great disparity. I should like the Government to state the correct position and keep the expenditure on staff well within justifiable limits. I trust that the Hon. Minister would furnish us with details and explain the

[Sri T. Purushotham] [18th December 1956]

figures referred to by me because I know that the answer of the Minister for Home Affairs in the Rajya Sabha was based on the figures furnished by the State Government.

4-20
p.m. Hon. Members should note that under Demand XVII—Public Health the amount required “on account” is Rs. 31,50,000. The obligation of the State to provide for rural areas substantial allotments in the matter of medical relief and maternity and child welfare schemes is yet to be fulfilled. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has also drawn the significant attention of the Government to this aspect in one of his recent speeches elsewhere. Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, the Union Health Minister, has stated at the recent meeting of the Central Council of Health that funds were available with the Central Government for Health Services, but that the State Governments had not taken advantage of the same and worked out schemes of improvement. Here again, the Government should enlighten us on how far this charge of surrender of funds allotted to the States would apply to our State. Even if we had been able to utilise the amounts allotted to us, presumably with the available amounts on account of the surrender by other States, we could have asked for more and launched on a State-wide comprehensive scheme for rural medical aid and maternity relief. I trust that the Government would apply themselves to this problem with greater keenness and approach the Centre for needed help in the matter.

On the question of medical relief, speaking recently at the Convocation of the College of Physicians and Surgeons at Bombay, our Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has observed that in view of the anxiety to have a large number of trained doctors in a short time, the choice was to have a cadre of persons not fully qualified but trained in some kind of compressed course to work as Assistant Doctors. I do not know how far this suggestion of our Prime Minister has been taken up by the State Government. He has also said that indigenous systems are rich as far as the curative and remedial aspects are concerned, and that in a country like India, advantage has to be taken of the indigenous systems. In this connection, I wish to state that the Government have recently placed the administration of Indian medicine in the hands of the Director of Allopathic Medicine. This is not a satisfactory arrangement. Dr. Usman Committee which has gone into the question fully has stated, ‘The need for establishing a separate Department of Indian Medicine is very great. For, it is unreasonable to throw on the shoulders of the present head of allopathic institutions whose primary concern is to foster the progress of Western medicine the additional and rather incompatible duty of fostering the progress of the system of medicine which he is apt to look down upon as unscientific and antiquated and superstitious, not worth his scientific study . . . Hence, the Committee says, ‘Under the existing conditions, for the earnest progress of the indigenous system, the establishment of a separate Department of Indian Medicine quite independent and distinct from the existing Department of Western Medicine is necessary.’ In the light of these findings of the Committee on Indian Medicine, the present administrative set-up of control under the

18th December 1956] [Sri T. Purushotham]

Director of Allopathic Medicine assisted by an Assistant Director of the same system of medicine who does not know the A, B, C of the Indian system of medicine needs revision. I would earnestly impress upon the Government the urgent need for the appointment of a Committee to review the position and introduce needed changes if any progress is to be achieved in this branch.

Sir, we find that special provision is made in the Budget for admission to sanatoria and treatment of prisoners suffering from tuberculosis. I would like to invite the attention of the hon. Members to the fact that policemen are posted to guard such patient-prisoners and under-trial prisoners in the tuberculosis hospitals and Leprosy Sanatoria. I have known cases where such policemen who are posted to guard these prisoner-patients got the disease themselves. The Government should provide for the grant of a suitable risk allowance to such policemen or jailors sent to these sanatoria for duty.

Sir, in this connection, I should like to say a few words on the Madras City traffic problem. This question figured in our discussions on the supplementary estimates at the last meeting. The situation has worsened and it needs immediate attention. You should have seen, Sir, the congestion during the last few days in the Mount Road Round Tana area. The Corporation of Madras mooted the construction of a sub-way to relieve this traffic congestion at the spot. I expected some provision for this in the Budget for helping the Corporation of Madras by way of grant or loan to push through the scheme of the proposed Arcade as in cities in the Western countries. This needs speedy action. But, in doing so, I should express my protest if any buildings or quarters in the Government House Estate are to be pulled down. I learn that there is a proposal to demolish the Goschen Block of residential quarters to widen the Road in that area. This should not be done. In these days of acute shortage of housing accommodation, any scheme for providing an Arcade or a sub-way or widening the Mount Road should be implemented without affecting the built-up quarters in that locality.

DR. V. K. JOHN : I would like to know from the hon. Member whether any such proposal was announced in the Press.

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Yes, it appeared in the Press that the Government wanted to widen that road and that there was a proposal to pull down the residential quarters inside the Government House Estate.

Sir, the Hon. the Minister for Finance has stated that the recent enhancement in dearness allowance for Non-Gazetted Officers would apply to local board's servants as well. But, I am reliably told that orders have not been issued to this effect and that even this temporary relief is denied to the local board establishments. I would appeal to the Government and the Hon. the Leader of the House to consider this aspect and ensure that specific orders are issued to local boards, municipalities and panchavats allowing their staff to draw the enhanced dearness allowance with effect from 1st November 1956 as in the case of the Non-Gazetted Officers.

[Sri T. Purushotham] [18th December 1956]

4-30
p.m.

Regarding sales-tax, representations were made in this House and in the Assembly that articles of food should be exempted from the levy of sales tax and that following that general principle, milk and coconut should be exempted from the levy of sales tax. This has been done in Mysore and other States and milk and coconut, I find, are not liable to levy of sales tax there. The Hon. the Minister for Revenue also assured us last time, when this question was raised in this House, that it would be considered when the Budget for 1957-58 was taken up. I, therefore, appeal to the Hon. the Minister for Finance and the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture to have this examined and to sanction the exemption of these articles of food from the levy of sales tax before the Budget is finalised.

We are glad that a large provision amounting to Rs. 16 crores has been made for expenditure during 1957-58 on electricity schemes and that rapid progress is being made in the execution of the Kundah and Periyar Projects. It is encouraging to learn that 1,000 villages will be electrified in the current year as against the target figure of 500. At this rate, it would not be too much to hope that all villages will be provided with electricity before the end of the Second Plan period. Also, we should congratulate the Government on the grant of certain concessions in the matter of levy of electricity charges on agricultural consumers. I should like to state, in this connection, that standard tariff rates based on the horse power of the pumpsets installed should be introduced and that the Government should take up with the Chief Engineer for Electricity the question of rationalisation of levy of electricity charges in respect of rural electrification schemes. If this is done, the agriculturists will feel greatly relieved.

Mr. Chairman, with the reorganization of States, the strength of this Council was reduced to 48. We are, however, glad that the strength has since been raised to 50 and that none of the Members have been obliged to go away. But, Sir, this 50 represents only the provisional strength of the Council. The Home Minister of the Government of India assured in the Rajya Sabha that the general question of increasing the strength of the Legislative Councils would be taken up separately. This number, 50, would not permit the proper adjustment of the constitutional provision regarding proportional representation for local authorities, graduates and teachers in the Council. Fifty should be raised to 64 so that the number may be easily divisible in accordance with the principle laid down in the Constitution. This point was raised in this House and we requested that the strength should be raised to 64. I hope that, in view of the assurances given by the Home Minister at the Centre, this question will be taken up again and the strength of this House raised to 64.

DR. V. K. JOHN : Will the hon. Member understand that the Madras Government are against it in spite of the resolutions passed by both the Houses?

18th December 1956]

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : I do not think such a serious charge is true. The Madras Government are not against the proposal at all, and I may assure the hon. Member about it, whatever the source of his information.

SRI MAHOMED USMAN : It is the Law Minister that said. 'We will consider'. The Home Minister at Delhi never said anything about it.

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : I am glad the hon. Member has made the position clear and I hope the Hon. the Leader of the House will consider all these aspects and see what best could be done.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to make a suggestion not entirely within the range of the Budget proposals. We have several distinguished visitors coming to Madras. I suggest that in the programme of visits of these V.I.Ps., an invitation to visit the Legislative Assembly or the Council might be included. Not that I desire that the Legislature should be summoned specially for the purpose but that they may be invited if the Legislature is in session during their visit to the City. May I not appeal to you, Sir, to examine and see that this is done in future?

Before I resume my seat, I should like to state how grateful we are to our Chief Minister, Mr. Kamaraj Nadar, and other Ministers for the splendid record of good work and services rendered by them to the State. I am sure hon. Members including the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, would join me, in wishing all our Ministers success in the coming elections.

DR. V. K. JOHN : Yes, except Ministers who are neglecting this House.

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Not only success in the election, but also I hope they will continue as Ministers. I hope that this will not be the last Budget to be presented by our energetic Finance Minister, the Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam, and that he will present many more Budgets to us.

As regards the Hon. the Leader of the House, I think he is anxious to transport himself to the other House, at any rate, he is desirous of doing so. All sections of this House will agree that he is an ideal Minister and an ideal Leader of the House. We wish him success. Even though he may go to the other House as member, I hope we will continue to have him as Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House will now adjourn and meet again at 3 p.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned.